

Attorney Docket No. 98-820 (65632-0180)

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 18-25 and 35 are allowable and that claims 27, 29, and 31-34 contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejected claims 14, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,308,199 ("Katsurabayashi"). The Office Action further rejected claims 1-8, 10, 12-13, 16, and 42-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Katsurabayashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,758,110 ("Boss"). The Office Action further rejected claims 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Katsurabayashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,324 ("Larson"). The Office Action further rejected claims 30 and 36-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Katsurabayashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,127 ("Anderson"). For the reasons stated below, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiners rejections of claims 1-17, 26, 28, 30, and 36-43.

Claims 14 and 17 have been amended to more clearly state certain novel aspects of the present invention, but these amendments are not believed to alter the scope of claims 14 and 17.

The Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended in response to the Examiner's comments in the Office Action (page 2).

Rejection of Claims 14, 15, and 17 As Anticipated by Katsurabayashi

Claims 14, 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Katsurabayashi.

Independent claims 14 and 17 as amended recite that a window list is displayed in a user interface. Katsurabayashi teaches a "management table" (see Fig. 3) that is maintained by a "user information management unit". (Col. 8, lines 24-35.) Katsurabayashi offers no teaching or suggestion that users can select the display of windows in an application sharing program, or that the list of windows available for display is presented to the user. Instead, Katsurabayashi teaches away from the claimed invention by disclosing that its user information management unit handles all decisions about what windows to display to each user. Katsurabayashi's disclosure thus obviates

Attorney Docket No. 98-820 (65632-0180)

any need to display a window list as presently claimed. Certainly Katsurabayashi does not teach that its management table is displayed in a user interface. The present invention, in contrast, displays a window list in a user interface, advantageously allowing a user to select windows to be displayed to selected users. (Specification, page 9, line 4 – page 10, line 3.) Thus, at a minimum, the claim limitation of “displaying the window list in a user interface” renders claims 14 and 17, as well as claims 15-16 depending from claim 14, patentably distinct from Katsurabayashi.

Accordingly, claims 14-17 are all in condition for allowance for at least the reason stated above.

Rejection of Claims 1-8, 10, 12-13, 16, 42 As Obvious Over Katsurabayashi and Boss

Claims 1-8, 10, 12-13, 16, 42, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Katsurabayashi in view of Boss.

Claims 1-13

Independent claims 1-2 recite selecting a document or documents “to be shared by the host user.” Independent claim 7 recites “selecting by the host user the document”. Similarly, independent claim 8 recites determining if a file associated with an application program has been selected and, if so, “providing a share view menu.” The Office Action does not address these claim limitations. The Office Action states only that “claim 1’s ‘sharing between a host user and at least one audience member’ follows in the teaching of Katsurabayashi, in that ‘selecting the at least one audience member’ reads upon selecting a window’s display status for individual users.” Accepting *arguendo* this statement as correct, the Office Action has still failed to state, much less show, that Katsurabayashi reads on selecting a document or file for display to a user or users as recited in claims 1-2 and 7-8.

In fact, Katsurabayashi plainly teaches, at most, determining which windows in an application that a user should see, rather than determining a selection of documents or files to be displayed. (See Abstract.) That is, Katsurabayashi is directed, at most, to allowing users to share an application, not to allowing users to share selected files and/or documents within an application. The teachings of Boss are equally distant from the

Attorney Docket No. 98-820 (65632-0180)

present claims; Boss teaches no more than methods for rendering and displaying application windows when control of those windows is shared by users of different computers. (Abstract; col. 2, lines 32-38.)

Even if Katsurabayashi did teach sharing selected documents and files, it is clear that any such selection would occur *after* a connection between the host and a client or clients had been established. That is, the mechanisms disclosed by Katsurabayashi for selecting windows for display to different users are applied when an application capable of receiving sharing events is already running in a local computer. (Col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 3.) Similarly, Boss teaches a system that is utilized only after an application-sharing session has been established in that Boss requires the initial designation of a shared application. (Col. 2, lines 32-47.) Claims 1-2 and 7-8, in contrast, recite selecting a file or document and *then* establishing a shared viewing thereof. As the Specification (page 2, line 22 – page 3, line 2) explains, this feature of the present invention, by allowing application programs to be minimally shared, is a significant advantage of the present invention over the teachings of the prior art.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-2 and 7-8 as well as dependent claims 3-6 and 9-13, depending respectively therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claim 10

Assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner correctly states that “[t]he ‘participant list’ of claim 10 . . . is characteristic of Katsurabayashi’s management table contents”, the Office Action simply does not address claim 10’s requirement that the participant be “associated with the share view menu in response to the selection of the file.” In fact, neither Katsurabayashi nor Boss teaches anything resembling the recited share view menu. As disclosed in the application (*see, e.g.*, Specification, page 9, lines 12-16; Fig. 5B), the share view menu allows selection of the participants with whom a document or file may be shared. As noted above, Katsurabayashi actually teaches away from allowing the selection of documents and files for a particular participant through a user interface, nor does Boss teach anything like this feature.

Accordingly, for at least this reason alone claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Attorney Docket No. 98-820 (65632-0180)

Rejection of Claims 26 and 28 as Obvious Over Katsurabayashi and Larson

Independent claims 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Katsurabayashi in view of Larson.

However, the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 26 and 28. Specifically, the Office Action does not provide support, either by way of Official Notice or citation to the prior art of record, for the assertion (page 7) that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Katsurabayashi and Larson “because this better preserves the structure of a collaborative work established by Katsurabayashi for later use.” The Office Action does not appear to suggest that motivation to combine Katsurabayashi and Larson is found in the prior art of record, and Applicants do not in fact believe that such motivation is found in the prior art of record. *See* MPEP § 2143.01. To the extent the Examiner may have taken Official Notice of such motivation, Applicants seasonably request support for the combination of Katsurabayashi and Larson, as provided by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.04.

Moreover, Katsurabayashi and Larson are not in fact susceptible of combination. Katsurabayashi teaches a system for sharing a computer application. (Abstract.) Larson teaches a system for storing parameters relating to a video conference. (Abstract; col. 5, line 57 – col. 6, line 35.) Accordingly, the conference object disclosed by Larson (Fig. 4) simply would not have been functional in the context of Katsurabayashi’s application-sharing system. Specifically, many of the fields stored in Larson’s conference object, including fields in session profile 75, participant profile 76, and policy profile 79, simply would have had no applicability to Katsurabayashi’s system. Moreover, Katsurabayashi teaches enabling multiple users to participate in a single session of a computer application, a different art than Larson’s disclosure of saving conference data. There is no suggestion in the prior art that one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to apply Larson’s teachings in the field of saving conference data to Katsurabayashi’s teaching of enabling computer application collaboration.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 26 and 28 are in condition for allowance.

Attorney Docket No. 98-820 (65632-0180)

Rejection of Claims 30 and 36-41 as Obvious Over Katsurabayashi and Anderson

Claims 30 and 36-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Katsurabayashi in view of Larson.

Independent Claim 30

Claim 30 recites “setting a use item equal to a menu item.” As the Specification explains (page 20, lines 18-20), a use item comprises a name and a network address. The Office Action’s rejection of claim 30 (page 7) depends on the implicit assertion that Katsurabayashi’s management table comprises use items, and on the explicitly asserted equivalence of Katsurabayashi’s management table with a menu. However, Katsurabayashi’s management table does not contain network addresses at all. (Fig. 3.) Further, as discussed above, Katsurabayashi’s management table does not comprise user selection of an item in a user interface, *i.e.*, a menu, but rather is a data structure used to facilitate a management unit’s determination of what windows to display to a user. As also discussed above, Katsurabayashi’s management table is never displayed in a user interface, and thus cannot be the menu recited in claim 30. Indeed, Applicants’ disclosure makes clear that the recited menu is displayed in a user interface to facilitate user selection of items. (*E.g.*, Figs. 5A – 5D.) As noted above, Katsurabayashi teaches away from such user selection. Katsurabayashi plainly does not read on claim 30’s limitation of “setting a use item equal to a menu item.”

Anderson does not make up for Katsurabayashi’s glaring deficiencies. The Office Action (page 7) concedes that Katsurabayashi does not teach “determining if the use item is currently in use” and “if the use item is not in use, setting a label of the use item to the target name; setting an address of the use item to the associated network address; and enabling use of the use item.” However, the Office Action (page 7) asserts that Anderson teaches at most “activation of a shared application” (emphases in original), failing to address specifically the afore-mentioned limitations of claim 30. Anderson clearly fails to teach the recited menu item, much less setting a use item equal to a menu item. Anderson is directed toward exchanging messages over a network in order to activate application sharing (Abstract; col. 3, lines 3-22), but teaches nothing about how network addresses are selected for application sharing. In fact, Anderson’s disclosure assumes

Attorney Docket No. 98-820 (65632-0180)

that a connection between a host computer and a guest computer has been established, and provides a mechanism for activating applications shared between the two. (*E.g.*, col. 3, lines 3-63.) Thus, Anderson certainly could not make any teaching directed toward setting a use item equal to a menu item, or determining if a use item, *i.e.*, a name, network address pair, was currently in use.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 30 is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claims 36 and 39

The Office Action (pages 7-8) asserts that Anderson suggests the “call manager” recited in claims 36 and 39 because Anderson teaches displaying “status information regarding the connectivity” of an application sharing program.” As the Specification explains (page 23, lines 4-14), the call manager is well known in the art. However, the prior art does not teach or suggest using the call manager in the novel way recited in claims 36 and 39. In particular, sharing applications as taught in Anderson is different from managing a call with multiple participants as recited in claim 36. At a minimum Anderson does not teach “the status information including the current number of participants” as recited in claims 36 and 39. Indeed, Anderson cannot even suggest such a teaching because Anderson is not directed toward the field of conferencing participants, but rather is directed only toward sharing applications between computers.

For at least the foregoing reason, claims 36 and 39 are in condition for allowance.

Attorney Docket No. 98-820 (65632-0180)

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are distinguished over the cited prior art and are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or issues relating to Applicants' response, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative.

Any fees associated with the filing of this paper should be identified in an accompanying transmittal. However, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this paper, permission is given to charge Deposit Account No. 07-2347. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to the foregoing deposit account number.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2004

By: 

Joel Wall, Reg. No. 25,648
Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.
600 Hidden Ridge Drive
Mailcode HQE03H14
Irving, TX 75038
972-718-4800

Customer No. 32127